

REMARKS**I. Status of the Claims**

Claims 1-15, 29 and 30 are currently pending. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in regard to claims 6-8.

By this Amendment, claims 1-4, 6-8, 15 and 30 have been amended. Claim 29 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been introduced by this Amendment. Entry and consideration of this Amendment are respectfully requested. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-15 and 30 would be pending.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, 1st paragraph

Claim 3 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification. Specifically, the Examiner states:

(how the reception means (presumably a reception means in the remotely-accessed facsimile at the user's office) can receive the identification, i.e., the fax number, of the remote fax machine at the visited site ("the other communication apparatus") "depending on whether or not" the identification of the calling party (at the remote site) is received. How can the reception means of the remotely-accessed fax machine (at the user's office) receive the DN of the fax machine at the remote/visit site if the calling party's identification, i.e., the fax's DN, has NOT been received, i.e. "whether or not"?.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of this claim, for the reasons set forth below.

As provided in an example in the specification, if the network does not notify the apparatus of the calling party number upon receiving the call and no calling party number is stored, the flow advances to step S207 in which the calling party is prompted to provide the forwarded-to-number. See specification, page 6, line 21 to page 7, line 6. Thus, claim 3 is supported by the specification and satisfies the requirements of section 112, first paragraph.

As to the Examiner's additional request for Applicant to use claim language like that found in the specification to avoid confusion, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as written are sufficiently clear and supported (as noted above) by the specification. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 3.

III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103

Claims 1-5, 9-12, 15, 29 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Mark (U.S. Patent No. 5,732,133), Wong et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,631,745) or O'Neal et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,263,064 B1). Claims 13 & 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mark, Wong et al or O'Neal et al. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims, for the reasons set forth below.

A. CLAIMS 1, 15 AND 29

Claims 1 and 15 are directed to a communication arrangement in which a communication apparatus is connectable to a communication network that provides a call forwarding service. The communication apparatus receives identification information of a calling party, and sets the communication network to activate the call forwarding

service such that an incoming call for the communication apparatus is forwarded to the calling party of ^{the received} ~~(the received~~ identification information.) The communication network thereafter performs the call forwarding service to forward an incoming call to the calling party.

In other words, the communication apparatus receives identification information of a calling party and, accordingly, sets the communication network to activate the calling forwarding service to forward subsequent calls for or directed to the communication apparatus to the calling party.

On the contrary, Mark shows a facsimile machine which transmits a fax and an identification code to a receiving facsimile machine. The fax may thereafter be accessed via the code. Mark, as relied upon by the Examiner, is silent as to any call forwarding feature or, more particularly, setting the communication network to forward calls for or directed to the communication apparatus itself to another location. See Mark, Col. 63, line 45 to Col. 64, line 11.

Wong shows an instrument 11 with fax capabilities, e.g., send and receive faxes. The instrument 11 may be programmed with a fax forward number so that any received fax can be sent directly to a phone number at any location. See Wong, col. 18, lines 6-36. That is, the instrument 11 itself, not the communication network, is programmed to forward faxes. Thus, Wong is also silent as to any communication apparatus receiving identification information of a calling party and setting the communication network to forward calls for or directed to the communication apparatus itself to the calling party.

*d, SA/Ref
from fax machine
receives the ID info of the
calling party and sets the commo
network, i.e. the forwarded from
fax machine, to forward calls
to the fax machine at the remote
site where the calling party is
now located*

O'Neal shows a control center for permitting a subscriber of a plurality of communication services of a unified messaging system to customize communication options pertaining to such services. The user may access the control center via a menu (e.g., audio or video) to modify options, such as call forwarding service or the "follow me" service or facsimile forward service, etc. O'Neal is silent as to the communication apparatus, e.g., the subscriber's communication device or the like, receiving identification information of a calling party and setting the communication network to forward calls for or directed to the communication apparatus to the calling party based on the received identification information. In other words, in O'Neal, call forwarding setup is not performed through the communication apparatus, but rather directly with the control center.

As to the Background discussions in O'Neal on Col. 3, lines 35-45, this section appears to discuss facsimile machines which simply enable the user to program the machine itself, not the communications network, to perform call forwarding. Thus, this cited portion of O'Neal is also silent as to any communication apparatus receiving identification-information of a calling party and setting the communication network to forward calls for or directed to the communication apparatus to the calling party.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 15 and their dependent claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Claim 29 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

B. CLAIM 30

Claim 30 is directed to a communication apparatus which detects an incoming call notified from the communication network that provides a call forwarding service, receives information designating forwarded to site via the communication network when the incoming call is detected, and notifies the communication network of the information such that an incoming call to the communication apparatus is forwarded to the forwarded-to site designated by the received information. Thus an incoming call after such notification is forwarded to the forwarded-to site by the service of the communication network.

For similar reasons as discussed above for claims 1 and 15, claim 30 is also patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

C. OFFICIAL NOTICE

The Examiner states that:

Whatever the “network” is in applicant’s device that does the call forwarding and is set by the user, official notice is taken that O’Neal, Wong & Mark have a similar device in their remotely-accessed fax machine such that when activated or “set” will forward all faxes to the user at the remote/visit site of the remote fax machine. (Office Action, page 4)

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner’s taking of Official Notice since it is apparent from the above discussions (e.g., for claims 1 and 15) that the claimed arrangements are clearly distinguishable over the disclosed devices or arrangements of the cited references.

IV. Objection to Claims 6-8

The Examiner has objected to claims 6-8 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. As base claim 1 is believed to be allowable for the reason as discussed above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection of these claims are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims and allowance of this application.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 13-4503, Order No. 1232-4534. A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 13-4503, Order No. 1232-4534. A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN

Dated: July 2, 2003

Mailing Address:
MORGAN & FINNEGAN
345 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10154
(212) 758-4800
(212) 751-6849 Facsimile

By: 

James Hwa
Registration No. 42,680
(202) 857-7887 Telephone
(202) 857-7929 Facsimile